No. 5573.149

No. 192-200

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
JAMES J. DAVIS, Secretary
CHILDREN'S BUREAU
GRACE ABBOTT, Chief

JUVENILE-COURT STATISTICS
1927

BASED ON INFORMATION SUPPLIED BY 42 COURTS

Bureau Publication No. 195

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1929

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C. Price 10 cents

U. S. SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

JAN 14 1930

CONTENTS

	Page
Letter of transmittal	v
A cooperative plan for obtaining national statistics of delinquency and of dependency and neglect	1
Courts furnishing statistical material for 1927	2
Analysis of cases dealt with	3
The cases reported	3
Number and types of cases	3
Methods by which cases were handled	5
Children involved in the cases	5
Race and nativity	5
Age distribution	7
Whereabouts	9
Delinquency cases	10
Sources of complaint	10
Place of care pending hearing or disposition	11
Charges	13
Dispositions	18
Cases discharged from probation	28
Dependency and neglect cases	28
Sources of complaint	28
Place of care pending hearing or disposition	29
Charges	30
Dispositions	31
Cases discharged from supervision	34
Appendix.—Trend in juvenile delinquency	35
Delinquency rates in 12 cities	35
Juveniles committed to institutions for juvenile delinquents and to penal institutions as reported by the United States Bureau of the Census	36

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
CHILDREN'S BUREAU,
Washington, October 18, 1929.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith the summary for 1927 of reports of cases of delinquency and dependency supplied to the Children's Bureau by juvenile courts. During the calendar year 1927, the first full year during which the bureau's plan for obtaining comparable statistics in this field was in operation, 43 courts supplied reports regularly. Alice Scott Nutt, of the social-service division, has been in immediate charge of the development of the plan for assembling uniform statistics of juvenile delinquency, in cooperation with Dr. Elizabeth C. Tandy, director of the statistical division, and Agnes K. Hanna, director of the social-service division.

Respectfully submitted.

GRACE ABBOTT, *Chief.*

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS,
Secretary of Labor.

JUVENILE-COURT STATISTICS, 1927

A COOPERATIVE PLAN FOR OBTAINING NATIONAL STATISTICS OF DELINQUENCY AND OF DEPENDENCY AND NEGLECT

For some years the Children's Bureau has been at work on a plan for making available current information on a national scale concerning trends in juvenile delinquency. The United States Bureau of the Census at approximately 10-year intervals publishes statistics of juvenile delinquents in institutions, but no attempt is made by that bureau to procure statistics concerning delinquents dealt with by courts in other ways than by institutional commitment.[1] Relatively few juvenile courts print annual reports which include statistical material. Lack of uniformity in methods of compiling statistics used in the different courts and marked variations in inclusions and methods of presentation make the statistics practically valueless for purposes of comparing delinquency rates in various localities, though they are of value in determining trends in individual communities from year to year. Comparable statistics with reference to cases of dependency and neglect dealt with by the courts are even more difficult to obtain, because of wider variation in the type of cases within the jurisdiction of the courts.

The importance, therefore, of agreement on a uniform plan for recording and compiling statistics of juvenile delinquency is apparent. With the assistance of the committee on records and statistics of the National Probation Association the Children's Bureau has devised such a method.[2] The response to the plan has been gratifying. Cooperation by juvenile courts and State departments of public welfare has increased steadily since its presentation. In several States the department of public welfare or some other State agency has taken the plan into consideration in making revisions of annual and monthly reports required of courts, and in other States these agencies have been active in calling the plan to the attention of juvenile-court judges and probation officers. By July 1, 1928, about 100 juvenile courts in various parts of the country, and several State departments concerned with juvenile-court work, were cooperating. Forty-two courts sent in statistical data for the entire calendar year 1927, and these data form the basis of this report.[3]

---

[1] Children under Institutional Care, 1923, p. 260. U. S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, 1927.

[2] The basis of the plan is the filling out of statistical cards—a yellow card for each case of delinquency disposed of during a calendar year, a blue card for each case of dependency or neglect disposed of, and a white card for each case of a child discharged from probation (in delinquency cases) or from supervision (in dependency or neglect cases). The yellow and blue cards differ only in the lists of charges and dispositions. The cards have been so arranged that little clerical work is involved; most of the information is entered by checking. Cards and a bulletin of instructions are furnished by the Children's Bureau without charge to cooperating courts, as are franks or addressed envelopes requiring no postage for use in mailing cards back to the bureau. Cards are returned to the bureau for tabulation at least once a year, and preferably several times each year.

The Children's Bureau prepares from the cards a set of 22 tables on printed forms for each court. These are sent to the courts for use in annual reports, if desired. The facts presented in these tables include charges, places children were cared for pending hearings, manner of dealing with cases, and dispositions. The number of different children dealt with, the number of repeaters, and certain social facts are also shown. For cases discharged from probation or supervision the length of the probation period and the reason for discharge are given. In a few instances the court preferred to compile its own tables in accordance with the Children's Bureau plan, instead of sending in cards.

[3] Cards were also supplied for 1927 by the District of Columbia juvenile court, but these were not received in time to be included in the tabulations.

COURTS FURNISHING STATISTICAL MATERIAL FOR 1927

Cards were received from 41 courts in 15 States for the entire calendar year 1927, and tables were prepared by 1 court.[1] The names of these courts with the largest city or town in the area served by each court are given below. For convenience each court will be designated hereafter only by the name of the territory over which it has jurisdiction.

	Largest city or town in area served
California: Juvenile court of the city and county of San Francisco	San Francisco.
Connecticut:	
Juvenile court of the city of Bridgeport	Bridgeport.
Juvenile court of Hartford	Hartford.
Indiana:	
Juvenile court of Clay County	Brazil.
Juvenile court of Delaware County	Muncie.
Juvenile court of Jennings County	North Vernon.
Juvenile court of Lake County	Gary.
Juvenile court of Marion County	Indianapolis.
Juvenile court of Monroe County	Bloomington.
Juvenile court of Vermillion County	Clinton.
Juvenile court of Wayne County	Richmond.
Juvenile court of Wells County	Bluffton.
Juvenile court of White County	Monticello.
Massachusetts: Middlesex County superior court	Lowell.
Michigan: Kent County probate court, juvenile division	Grand Rapids.
Minnesota:	
Juvenile court of Hennepin County	Minneapolis.
Juvenile court of Ramsey County	St. Paul.
New Jersey:	
Juvenile court of the county of Hudson	Jersey City.
Juvenile court of the county of Mercer	Trenton.
New York:	
Children's court of Buffalo	Buffalo.
Clinton County children's court	Plattsburg.
Columbia County children's court	Hudson.
Delaware County children's court	Walton.
Dutchess County children's court	Poughkeepsie.
Erie County children's court	Lackawanna.
Franklin County children's court	Malone.
Children's court of the city of New York	New York.
Orleans County children's court	Medina.
Westchester County children's court	Yonkers.
North Carolina:	
Juvenile court of Buncombe County	Asheville.
Winston-Salem juvenile court	Winston-Salem.
Ohio:	
Franklin County juvenile court	Columbus.
Common-pleas court of Hamilton County, division of domestic relations, juvenile court and marital relations	Cincinnati.
Common-pleas court of Mahoning County, division of domestic relations	Youngstown.
Pennsylvania:	
Juvenile court of Berks County	Reading.
Juvenile court of Lycoming County	Williamsport.
Juvenile court of Montgomery County	Norristown.
Municipal court of Philadelphia, juvenile division	Philadelphia.
Tennessee: Juvenile court of Memphis	Memphis.
Virginia: Juvenile and domestic-relations court of Norfolk	Norfolk.
Washington: Pierce County juvenile court	Tacoma.
Wisconsin: Dane County juvenile court	Madison.

[1] Tables prepared by two other courts were not entirely comparable with tables prepared by the Children's Bureau and were not used in this report.

ANALYSIS OF CASES DEALT WITH

THE CASES REPORTED

Number and types of cases.

In order to obtain complete information on all cases, those disposed of by the courts or discharged from probation or supervision during the year were reported, rather than those referred to the courts or placed on probation or under supervision. Cards or tables for such cases, with a few exceptions, were received from each of the 42 courts during 1927.[1] The total number of cases reported by these courts was 46,750. (Table 1.) The number of cases reported by individual courts ranged from 14 to 11,281. This variation in number of cases was largely due to the area of jurisdiction; some of the courts had jurisdiction over densely populated areas in large cities, other courts served smaller cities, and others rural districts.

Delinquency cases were reported by each of the 42 courts, but 8 did not report cases of dependency or neglect. The total number of dependency and neglect cases (12,150) is less than half the number of delinquency cases (26,241) reported by the 34 courts sending cards or tables for both types of cases. The proportions of dependency and neglect and delinquency cases cared for by the different courts showed much variation. Eight of these 34 courts reported more dependency and neglect than delinquency cases; in the other 26 courts dependency and neglect cases constituted the smaller part of the court's work. The wide variation in the proportion of dependency and neglect cases appears to be due in part to the extent to which local agencies other than the court were caring for dependent and neglected children. The practice in some courts of filing the complaint against the adult responsible for dependency or neglect instead of instituting proceedings in the name of the children is also a factor. In some localities only those cases of dependency and neglect requiring court action were brought as a rule to the attention of the court, and these usually by social agencies, whereas in other communities a large proportion of the dependent and neglected children were referred to the court directly by parents and relatives, and the court became a general agency for dealing with such children. The proportion of cases of dependency and neglect for which source of complaint was reported, referred to the courts by parents and relatives in different localities, varied from zero to 67 per cent.

[1] The court in New York City sent in only those cases disposed of by the court that had been referred to the court during the year, and only those cases of children discharged from probation or supervision who had been placed on probation or under supervision during the year. No cards for girls were received from a few courts in which it is probable that girls' cases had been disposed of. A few courts failed to send in a separate card for each case when a child had been brought before the court more than once during the year. Eleven courts did not report cases of children discharged from probation or supervision.

TABLE 1.—*Number of delinquency cases and of dependency and neglect cases of boys and girls and number of cases of boys and girls discharged from probation or supervision dealt with by 42 specified courts in 1927*

Court	Cases dealt with									
	Total[1]	Delinquency cases			Dependency and neglect cases			Cases of children discharged from probation or supervision		
		Total	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls
Total	46,750	28,387	24,244	4,143	12,150	[2] 4,332	[2] 4,132	6,213	[2] 3,777	[2] 993
California: San Francisco City and County	2,058	950	873	77	687	344	343	421	234	187
Connecticut:										
Bridgeport	750	516	440	76	83	36	47	151	140	11
Hartford	973	618	539	79	154	83	71	201	172	29
Indiana:										
Clay County	39	25	14	11	4	1	3	10	6	4
Delaware County	130	65	47	18	------	------	------	65	43	22
Jennings County	16	4	4	------	12	7	5	------	------	------
Lake County	1,011	527	343	184	348	175	173	136	97	39
Marion County	1,532	892	589	303	291	146	145	149	95	54
Monroe County	36	15	10	5	------	------	------	21	7	14
Vermillion County	164	84	54	30	------	------	------	80	54	26
Wayne County	44	24	15	9	20	14	6	------	------	------
Wells County	41	41	23	18	------	------	------	------	------	------
White County	14	3	3	------	11	5	6	------	------	------
Massachusetts: Middlesex County	27	27	24	3	------	------	------	------	------	------
Michigan: Kent County	602	374	374	------	208	100	108	20	20	------
Minnesota:										
Hennepin County	1,489	966	776	190	342	170	172	181	145	36
Ramsey County	624	342	270	72	111	52	59	171	153	18
New Jersey:										
Hudson County	1,920	1,685	1,482	203	------	------	------	235	204	31
Mercer County	317	215	197	18	------	------	------	102	98	4
New York:										
Buffalo	1,076	836	785	51	95	49	46	145	132	13
Clinton County	103	23	18	5	79	40	39	1	1	------
Columbia County	260	98	84	14	121	56	65	41	26	15
Delaware County	14	14	14	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Dutchess County	518	223	183	40	271	123	148	24	21	3
Erie County	317	177	159	18	54	28	26	86	83	3
Franklin County	58	34	25	9	24	16	8	------	------	------
New York City	10,650	6,102	5,262	840	3,243	1,743	1,500	1,305	974	331
Orleans County	28	9	8	1	15	7	8	4	3	1
Westchester County	1,706	1,104	950	154	302	151	151	300	268	32
North Carolina:										
Buncombe County	304	144	122	22	160	72	88	------	------	------
Winston-Salem	319	295	239	56	24	9	15	------	------	------
Ohio:										
Franklin County	1,492	883	674	209	262	146	116	347	309	38
Hamilton County	1,861	1,332	1,332	[3]	254	120	134	275	275	------
Mahoning County	2,017	1,684	1,391	293	223	105	118	110	89	21
Pennsylvania:										
Berks County	68	48	39	9	13	4	9	7	3	4
Lycoming County	29	10	6	4	17	7	10	2	1	1
Montgomery County	84	53	40	13	31	18	13	------	------	------
Philadelphia	11,281	6,152	5,396	756	3,686	[4]	[4]	1,443	[4]	[4]
Tennessee: Memphis	1,562	852	672	180	653	328	325	57	31	26
Virginia: Norfolk	1,003	728	615	113	186	90	96	89	80	9
Washington: Pierce County	219	126	98	28	93	53	40	------	------	------
Wisconsin: Dane County	194	87	55	32	73	34	39	34	13	21

[1] This column shows the total number of cards received from each court. Some duplication occurs between the columns showing delinquency and dependency and neglect cases disposed of and the column showing cases discharged from probation or supervision, since a child may have been placed on probation or under supervision in a delinquency, dependency, or neglect case and discharged from this probation or supervision during 1927.

[2] Not including Philadelphia.

[3] Tables for about 700 girls' cases not included.

[4] Sex not reported.

Cases of children discharged from probation or supervision during the year were reported by 31 courts. Eleven courts did not report cases of children discharged from probation or supervision during the year, and a number reported only a few. Some of these courts had failed to keep adequate probation records, and others took no cognizance of the termination of the probation period either by formal discharge or by removal of the case from the list or index of active probation cases.

The proportions of boys and girls were about equal in dependency cases. In delinquency cases the number of boys reported (24,244) was nearly six times the number of girls (4,143). There was, however, much variation in the proportion of delinquent girls in different localities.

Methods by which cases were handled.

Information was collected for what are usually described as official and unofficial cases, the same cards being used for both, but separate lists of dispositions were used. Unofficial cases may be defined as cases adjusted informally by the judge, referee, or probation officer without being placed on the court calendar by the filing of a petition or other legal paper for adjudication by the judge or referee. As is shown by the accompanying table (Table 2) the practice of the court in regard to unofficial handling of cases varied in different localities. Twenty-three courts reported delinquency cases disposed of unofficially, and 19 courts did not report any so disposed of. Only 16 of the 34 courts sending information concerning dependency and neglect cases reported such cases disposed of unofficially.

Slightly more than one-fourth of the delinquency cases reported were dealt with unofficially. In four courts handling 50 or more cases (1 in Indiana, 1 in North Carolina, and 2 in Ohio) from 76 to 97 per cent of the delinquency cases were handled unofficially. The total number of cases dealt with by two of these courts was large. In several courts there were differences in the practice of handling of boys' and girls' cases. This was especially marked in two courts. In Marion County, Ind., a much larger proportion of the girls' cases than of the boys' cases were handled unofficially, whereas in San Francisco, Calif., the situation was reversed.

One-fifth of the dependency and neglect cases reported were dealt with unofficially. In three courts (one in North Carolina, one in Ohio, and one in Tennessee) more than half of the dependency and neglect cases were so dealt with.

CHILDREN INVOLVED IN THE CASES [2]

Race and nativity.

As a number of children came before the courts more than once the 28,387 delinquency cases represented 25,456 children and the 12,150 dependency and neglect cases, 11,785 children. Of the 25,305 delinquent children for whom race was reported, 84 per cent were white and 16 per cent colored. As would be expected, the proportion of colored children was larger in the southern courts. In Winston-Salem, N. C., 73 per cent and in Norfolk, Va., 52 per cent of the delinquent children were colored. In the northern and mid-

[2] Information used in this section for each delinquent child is based on his first case of delinquency disposed of during the year, and for each dependent or neglected child on his first case of dependency or neglect disposed of during the year.

TABLE 2.—*Number of official and unofficial delinquency cases and dependency and neglect cases dealt with by 42 specified courts during 1927*

Court	Delinquency cases				Dependency and neglect cases			
	Total	Official	Unofficial		Total	Official	Unofficial	
			Number	Per cent [1]			Number	Per cent [1]
Total	28,387	20,827	7,560	27	12,150	9,777	2,373	20
California: San Francisco City and County	950	738	212	22	687	684	3	-------
Connecticut:								
Bridgeport	516	331	185	36	83	70	13	16
Hartford	618	378	240	39	154	142	12	8
Indiana:								
Clay County	25	13	12	-------	4	4	-------	-------
Delaware County	65	38	27	42	-------	-------	-------	-------
Jennings County	4	4	-------	-------	12	12	-------	-------
Lake County	527	341	186	35	348	213	135	39
Marion County	892	670	222	25	291	291	-------	-------
Monroe County	15	10	5	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Vermillion County	84	9	75	89	-------	-------	-------	-------
Wayne County	24	13	11	-------	20	20	-------	-------
Wells County	41	12	29	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
White County	3	3	-------	-------	11	7	4	-------
Massachusetts: Middlesex County	27	27	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Michigan: Kent County	374	374	-------	-------	208	208	-------	-------
Minnesota:								
Hennepin County	966	966	-------	-------	342	342	-------	-------
Ramsey County	342	342	-------	-------	111	111	-------	-------
New Jersey:								
Hudson County	1,685	1,685	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Mercer County	215	215	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
New York:								
Buffalo	836	836	-------	-------	95	95	-------	-------
Clinton County	23	19	4	-------	79	48	31	39
Columbia-County	98	97	1	1	121	121	-------	-------
Delaware County	14	14	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Dutchess County	223	219	4	2	271	259	12	4
Erie County	177	177	-------	-------	54	54	-------	-------
Franklin County	34	34	-------	-------	24	24	-------	-------
New York City	6,102	6,102	-------	-------	3,243	3,243	-------	-------
Orleans County	9	8	1	-------	15	14	1	-------
Westchester County	1,104	657	447	40	302	297	5	2
North Carolina:								
Buncombe County	144	5	139	97	160	57	103	64
Winston-Salem	295	295	-------	-------	24	24	-------	-------
Ohio:								
Franklin County	883	883	-------	-------	262	262	-------	-------
Hamilton County	1,332	38	1,294	97	254	114	140	55
Mahoning County	1,684	403	1,281	76	223	190	33	15
Pennsylvania:								
Berks County	48	48	-------	-------	13	13	-------	-------
Lycoming County	10	10	-------	-------	17	17	-------	-------
Montgomery County	53	53	-------	-------	31	31	-------	-------
Philadelphia	6,152	3,248	2,904	47	3,686	2,312	1,374	37
Tennessee: Memphis	852	601	251	29	653	190	463	71
Virginia: Norfolk	728	728	-------	-------	186	186	-------	-------
Washington: Pierce County	126	123	3	2	93	79	14	15
Wisconsin: Dane County	87	60	27	31	73	43	30	41

[1] Not shown where base is less than 50.

western courts the percentages of colored children varied from zero to 29. Of the 11,737 dependent or neglected children for whom race was reported, dealt with by the 34 courts (both northern and southern) reporting dependency or neglect cases, only 13 per cent were colored, as compared with 16 per cent of the delinquent children.

As might be expected from the differences in the racial groups living in the localities served by the courts, the proportions of children of native parentage and of foreign or mixed parentage com-

ing before the courts showed great variation. Forty-one courts reported nativity and parentage for 18,722 delinquent white children; one court is omitted because it reported an error in its method of checking nativity and parentage. Of the 15,905 boys in this group 39 per cent were native born of native parentage, 51 per cent were native born of foreign or mixed parentage, 4 per cent were native born of parentage not reported, and 6 per cent were foreign born. Of the 2,817 girls 50 per cent were native born of native parentage, 40 per cent were native born of foreign or mixed parentage, 3 per cent were native born of parentage not reported, and 7 per cent were foreign born. Among the 9,796 dependent and neglected white children for whom nativity and parentage were reported by these 41 courts, the proportion of native born of native parentage was much greater (55 per cent) than of native born of foreign or mixed parentage (37 per cent). The proportions of native-born children whose parentage was not reported (3 per cent) and of foreign-born children (6 per cent) were about the same as in delinquency cases.

The proportion of the children dealt with who were foreign born was small for all courts reporting except New York City, where 15 per cent of the delinquent white boys, 19 per cent of the delinquent white girls, and 18 per cent of the dependent and neglected white children, both boys and girls, were reported as foreign born.

Age distribution.

Of the 42 courts reporting to the Children's Bureau 20 had jurisdiction over children up to 16 years of age [3]; 2 (Kent County, Mich., and Memphis, Tenn.) had jurisdiction up to 17 years; 7 had jurisdiction up to 18 years [4]; and the jurisdiction of 1 (San Francisco City and County, Calif.) extended to 21 years. Of the remaining 12 courts 10 had jurisdiction over delinquent, dependent, and neglected boys up to 16, delinquent girls up to 18, and dependent and neglected girls up to 17 [5]; 1 (Dane County, Wis.) had jurisdiction over delinquent boys up to 17, delinquent girls up to 18, and dependent and neglected children up to 16; and 1 (Middlesex County, Mass.) had jurisdiction over delinquent children between 7 and 17 years and neglected children under 16 years of age.

The age distribution of children dealt with on charges of delinquency by courts having original jurisdiction over children of specified ages is shown in Table 3. The largest percentages of both boys and girls were between 14 and 16 years of age, and the next largest percentages were between 12 and 14 years of age. That the number of girls and boys over 16, however, would probably have been larger had it not been for the limitation of the jurisdiction of many courts to children under that age is evident from the age distribution in courts having jurisdiction beyond 16 years. The inclusion in each group of a few children beyond the age of original jurisdiction specified is explained by the fact that some courts have jurisdiction beyond the age

[3] Bridgeport and Hartford, Conn.; Hudson County and Mercer County, N. J. (girls up to 17 may be committed by the juvenile court to the State home for girls); Buffalo, Clinton County, Columbia County, Delaware County, Dutchess County, Erie County, Franklin County, New York City, Orleans County, and Westchester County, N. Y.; Buncombe County and Winston-Salem, N. C.; and Berks County, Lycoming County, Montgomery County, and Philadelphia, Pa.

[4] Hennepin County and Ramsey County, Minn.; Franklin County, Hamilton County, and Mahoning County, Ohio; Norfolk, Va.; and Pierce County, Wash.

[5] Clay County, Delaware County, Jennings County, Lake County, Marion County, Monroe County, Vermillion County, Wayne County, Wells County, and White County, Ind.

of original jurisdiction in certain situations; for example, a case in which the offense was committed before the age limit was reached, even though the case did not come to the attention of the court until afterwards, and a case in which a child made a ward of the court before reaching the age limit was before the court on a new charge.

Eight per cent of the delinquent boys and 4 per cent of the delinquent girls reported were under 10 years of age. Children of this age group were reported by 35 of the 42 courts. Nearly two-thirds of these boys (971 of the 1,552) were dealt with officially. The situation with regard to girls was similar; 78 of the 152 girls under 10 years were dealt with officially.

TABLE 3.—*Ages of boys and girls dealt with in delinquency cases by 42 courts during 1927, by age limitation of original court jurisdiction*

Age and sex of child	Children dealt with by courts							
	Total		Having specified age limitations of original jurisdiction					
			Under 16 years [1]		Under 18 years [2]		18 years and over [3]	
	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution
Total	25,456		17,462		7,129		865	
Boys	21,539		15,243		5,505		791	
Age reported	20,373	100	14,263	100	5,327	100	783	100
Under 10 years	1,552	8	1,204	8	309	6	39	5
10 years, under 12	3,117	15	2,456	17	600	11	61	8
12 years, under 14	5,575	27	4,391	31	1,069	20	115	15
14 years, under 16	7,929	39	5,992	42	1,657	31	280	36
16 years and over	[4] 2,200	11	220	2	1,692	32	288	37
Age not reported	1,166		980		178		8	
Girls	3,917		2,219		1,624		74	
Age reported	3,713	100	2,071	100	1,573	100	69	100
Under 10 years	152	4	102	5	48	3	2	3
10 years, under 12	261	7	188	9	71	5	2	3
12 years, under 14	773	21	527	25	238	15	8	12
14 years, under 16	1,848	50	1,186	57	641	41	21	30
16 years and over	[4] 679	18	68	3	575	37	36	52
Age not reported	204		148		51		5	

[1] Includes Westchester County, N. Y., where jurisdiction extends to 18 in truancy cases; also Hudson County and Mercer County, N. J., where girls up to 17 may be committed to the State school for girls by the juvenile court.

[2] Includes Middlesex County, Mass., Kent County, Mich., and Memphis, Tenn., where jurisdiction is under 17 years, and Dane County, Wis., where jurisdiction is under 17 years for boys.

[3] Includes San Francisco City and County, Calif., only.

[4] 41 courts (exclusive of Philadelphia) reported 59 boys and 28 girls as "18 years of age and over."

As the following table shows, the number of children before the courts on dependency and neglect charges was about the same for each 2-year age period up to 14 when there was a distinct falling off.

Age	Number of children	Per cent distribution
Total	11,785	
Age reported	10,796	100
Under 2 years	1,357	13
2 years, under 4	1,413	13
4 years, under 6	1,455	13
6 years, under 8	1,584	15
8 years, under 10	1,418	13
10 years, under 12	1,410	13
12 years, under 14	1,204	11
14 years, under 16	858	8
16 years and over	97	1
Age not reported	989	

Whereabouts.[6]

Two-thirds of the delinquent boys and almost one-half of the delinquent girls for whom whereabouts was reported were living with both own parents when referred to the court. The whereabouts of the delinquent children was as follows:

Whereabouts	Boys		Girls	
	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution
Total	16,584		3,098	
Whereabouts reported	16,258	100	3,040	100
With both own parents	10,947	67	1,454	48
With parent and step-parent	1,410	9	387	13
With mother only	2,088	13	527	17
With father only	810	5	198	7
In adoptive home	72	(1)	34	1
In other family home	714	4	324	11
In institution	149	1	68	2
In other place	68	(1)	48	2
Whereabouts not reported	326		58	

[1] Less than 1 per cent.

Among the delinquent boys and girls reported as living with only one parent the absence of the other parent, in the majority of instances, was due to death. Almost three-fourths of the boys and the same proportion of the girls living with one parent only were with their mothers. Of the children living with a parent and a step-parent about two-thirds were with a mother and a stepfather, the proportion being slightly higher for boys than for girls.

[6] Figures are omitted in this section for 1 court in which the proportion of children living with both own parents was so large as to indicate inaccuracy in the reporting of this item.

The following table shows with whom dependent and neglected children were living when referred to the court:

Whereabouts	Number of children	Per cent distribution
Total	8,618	
Whereabouts reported	8,521	100
With both own parents	1,804	21
With parent and step-parent	344	4
With mother only	2,756	32
With father only	1,560	18
In adoptive home	90	1
In other family home	1,491	17
In institution	440	5
In other place	36	(1)
Whereabouts not reported	97	

[1] Less than 1 per cent.

Among dependent and neglected children living with only one parent, the absence of the other parent was due to death in slightly more than one-fourth of the cases. Desertion was a much greater factor in dependency and neglect than in delinquency, as was also a group of miscellaneous conditions classed as "other" which included separation without divorce and confinement of one parent in a hospital or a correctional institution. Among dependent and neglected children living with their mothers only, the number of instances in which the absence of the father was due to desertion and to "other" conditions was greater than the number due to death. As among delinquent children, the majority of dependent and neglected children living with one parent only were with their mothers.

DELINQUENCY CASES

Sources of complaint.

The source from which cases are received is some indication of the court's relation to the community. It is to be expected that a large proportion of complaints in delinquency cases would be received from the police. The number received from school departments is an indication of the extent to which the school handles its truancy and behavior problems or refers them to the juvenile court. It is necessary to make a distinction between the person or agency that brings the case to the attention of the court or probation office by making the initial complaint and the person who signs the petition or legal paper necessary to institute court action. Since the signing of the petition may be dependent on court policy the former is more significant and was used as the basis of tabulation so far as courts were able to give this information. Some courts, for instance, prefer that the probation officer should not sign such a paper lest his later contact with the family be rendered more difficult thereby.

The police made the complaint in 62 per cent of the delinquency cases for which source of complaint was reported. In one court practically all the complaints (99.6 per cent) were received from the police. In another court only 15 per cent of the complaints were received from this source, the smallest percentage reported by the police in any court. The highest percentages for sources of complaint

other than police in any court reporting 50 or more cases were: Individual other than parent or relative, 57; probation officer, 47; school department, 30; social agency, 8.

The sources of complaint in delinquency cases were as follows:

Source of complaint	Number	Per cent distribution
Total	28,387	
Source of complaint reported	27,967	100
Police	17,319	62
Parents or relatives	2,775	10
Other individual (not probation officer)	2,749	10
School department	2,602	9
Probation officer	864	3
Social agency	693	2
Other source of complaint	965	3
Source of complaint not reported	420	

Place of care pending hearing or disposition.

In more than half the delinquency cases, as is shown by Tables 4 and 5, the children were not detained but were allowed to remain in their own homes pending hearing, or their cases were disposed of on the day the complaint was made. Detention was not used to any extent in most of the smaller courts; in the larger courts the practices varied considerably. The cases in which children remained in their own homes or which were disposed of within one day varied in courts handling 50 or more cases from 97 per cent of all the cases in Winston-Salem, N. C., to 27 per cent in Hamilton County, Ohio. Twenty-four of the forty-two courts used boarding homes for children who were not left in their own homes pending hearing, but the number of children thus cared for was very small. Detention homes and other institutions (including receiving homes or shelters of private agencies and hospitals) were used in more than one-third of the delinquency cases in which place of care was reported. The courts reporting the greatest use of detention homes were those in Hamilton County, Ohio, Montgomery County, Pa., and Memphis, Tenn. New York City, which does not maintain a municipal detention home, using instead the shelter of a private agency, reported the majority of the cases in which children were cared for in other institutions.

Almost a thousand children (4 per cent of the number for whom place of care was reported) were held in jails or police stations pending hearing or disposition of their cases. Cases of jail or police-station detention were reported by 26 courts; 69 per cent of the cases so detained were reported by 3 courts. If all these cases were of actual detention overnight or longer these figures would represent a serious situation. But from a comparison of the dates on which the cases had been referred to and disposed of by the courts, it was evident that a few courts reported detention care when the child was held in the jail or police station for a few hours pending arrival of parents or attention from the court. Included in these figures also were 158 cases in which the child was held for only part of the detention period in the jail or police station and the remainder of the time elsewhere. Although the largest numbers of children detained in jail were reported by courts having jurisdiction over children up to 18

years of age, many young children had been detained. Seventy detained children were under 14 years of age, 305 were between 14 and 16 years, and 590 were 16 years of age or over.

TABLE 4.—*Place of care pending hearing or disposition of case in delinquency cases dealt with by 42 specified courts during 1927*

Court	Delinquency cases								
		Place of care							
	Total	Own home or case disposed of same day	Boarding home	Detention home [1]	Other institution [2]	Jail or police station [3]	More than 1 place of care [4]	Other place of care	Not reported
Total	28,387	14,751	69	5,585	3,201	979	274	112	3,416
California: San Francisco City and County	950	527	6	334	15	21	-------	22	25
Connecticut:									
Bridgeport	516	472	3	-------	20	19	-------	-------	2
Hartford	618	551	3	58	5	-------	-------	1	-------
Indiana:									
Clay County	25	7	2	8	-------	-------	-------	-------	8
Delaware County	65	29	-------	27	-------	9	-------	-------	-------
Jennings County	4	4	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Lake County	527	438	10	53	-------	14	-------	4	8
Marion County	892	705	4	152	2	20	1	7	1
Monroe County	15	6	-------	-------	2	1	-------	-------	6
Vermillion County	84	75	6	1	1	1	-------	-------	-------
Wayne County	24	18	-------	5	-------	1	-------	-------	-------
Wells County	41	36	-------	5	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
White County	3	3	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Massachusetts: Middlesex County	27	25	1	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	1
Michigan: Kent County	374	190	1	181	-------	-------	-------	-------	2
Minnesota:									
Hennepin County	966	810	1	53	7	69	3	5	18
Ramsey County	342	167	2	52	13	100	1	1	6
New Jersey:									
Hudson County	1,685	1,171	5	500	3	1	-------	3	2
Mercer County	215	197	-------	-------	-------	17	-------	1	-------
New York:									
Buffalo	836	526	-------	310	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Clinton County	23	16	-------	7	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Columbia County	98	81	-------	10	4	2	-------	-------	1
Delaware County	14	14	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Dutchess County	223	208	5	-------	3	4	-------	3	-------
Erie County	177	144	3	1	21	-------	6	2	-------
Franklin County	34	25	2	-------	4	-------	-------	2	1
New York City	6,102	2,751	1	-------	2,957	-------	50	3	340
Orleans County	9	9	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Westchester County	1,104	778	1	-------	98	1	191	30	5
North Carolina:									
Buncombe County	144	131	1	8	1	3	-------	-------	-------
Winston-Salem	295	286	4	5	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Ohio:									
Franklin County	883	302	1	335	1	221	18	2	3
Hamilton County	1,332	353	-------	945	-------	25	1	2	6
Mahoning County	1,684	1,028	3	241	11	358	1	10	32
Pennsylvania:									
Berks County	48	35	-------	11	-------	2	-------	-------	-------
Lycoming County	10	7	1	-------	-------	1	-------	-------	1
Montgomery County	53	17	-------	36	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Philadelphia	6,152	1,844	-------	1,371	13	6	-------	3	[5] 2,915
Tennessee: Memphis	852	268	-------	543	6	7	1	5	22
Virginia: Norfolk	728	377	2	274	6	64	-------	3	2
Washington: Pierce County	126	58	-------	53	1	9	-------	1	4
Wisconsin: Dane County	87	62	1	6	7	3	1	2	5

[1] Including cases of children cared for part of the time in detention home and the remainder of the time elsewhere, but not including cases of children also held at jail or police station.
[2] Including cases of children cared for in receiving home or shelter of private agency and other institution.
[3] Including cases of children cared for part of the time in police station or jail and the remainder of the time elsewhere.
[4] Not including detention home, police station, or jail.
[5] Place of care not reported for unofficial cases. According to information received from the court children in these cases are cared for in their own homes or in the homes of relatives.

A larger percentage of the boys than of the girls were permitted to remain in their own homes, or their cases were disposed of on the same day. (Table 5.) Detention homes or other institutions were used more frequently in girls' cases than in boys' cases, but in only 2 per cent of the girls' cases as compared with 4 per cent of the boys' cases were the offenders detained in jail or police station.

TABLE 5.—*Places of care pending hearing or disposition of delinquency cases of boys and girls dealt with by 42 courts during 1927*

Place of care	Delinquency cases					
	Total		Boys		Girls	
	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution
Total	28,387		24,244		4,143	
Places of care reported	24,971	100	21,232	100	3,739	100
Own home or case disposed of same day	14,751	59	12,850	61	1,901	51
Boarding home	69	(1)	40	(1)	29	1
Detention home or other institution	[2] 8,786	35	[2] 7,183	34	[2] 1,603	43
Detention home	[2] 5,585	22	[2] 4,611	22	[2] 974	26
Other institution	3,201	13	2,572	12	629	17
Jail or police station	979	4	898	4	81	2
Only place of care	821	3	747	4	74	2
One of the places of care	158	1	151	1	7	(1)
More than one place of care	[3] 274	1	[3] 214	1	[3] 60	2
Other place of care	112	(1)	47	(1)	65	2
Places of care not reported	[4] 3,416		3,012		404	

[1] Less than 1 per cent.
[2] Including cases of children cared for part of the time in detention home and the remainder of the time elsewhere, but not including cases of children also held at jail or police station.
[3] Not including detention home, police station, or jail.
[4] Including Philadelphia's unofficial cases for which place of care was not reported.

Charges.

Though an attempt is being made to secure uniformity in the use of terms, the charges on which children were dealt with as delinquents by the courts give a very incomplete picture of their behavior problems. A child may have committed several offenses at or about the same time but be referred to court on only one of them. The specific offense with which he is charged may be much less serious than offenses discovered in the course of the social investigation. When the case is investigated before the filing of a petition instead of afterward the formal charge is usually more accurate, but even in such cases the offense stated in the complaint may reflect the desire of the court to protect the child. For instance, in some courts a girl is charged with incorrigibility instead of a sex offense, and a boy with trespassing and taking the property of another instead of with "breaking and entering" or "burglary."

As is shown by the recorded offenses the boys and girls present quite different delinquency problems. More than two-thirds of the boys were charged with stealing or with acts of carelessness or mischief. With the girls "running away," "ungovernable or beyond parental control," and "sex offense" were the most frequent charges, two-thirds of them having been charged with these offenses.

TABLE 6.—*Charges in boys' delinquency cases dealt with by 42 specified courts during 1927*

Court	Boys' delinquency cases																		
	Total	Charge on which referred to court																	
		Total reported	Stealing or attempted stealing		Truancy		Running away		Ungovernable or beyond parental control		Sex offense		Injury or attempted injury to person		Act of carelessness or mischief		Other		Not reported
			Number	Per cent[1]	Number	Per cent[1]	Number	Per cent[1]	Number	Per cent[1]	Number	Per cent[1]	Number	Per cent[1]	Number	Per cent[1]	Number	Per cent[1]	
Total	24,244	24,054	10,033	42	1,839	8	1,735	7	1,733	7	541	2	814	3	6,616	28	743	3	190
California: San Francisco City and County	873	872	405	46	76	9	46	5	119	14	38	4	29	3	138	16	21	2	1
Connecticut:																			
Bridgeport	440	438	111	25	49	11	38	9	28	6	13	3	4	1	195	45			2
Hartford	539	539	175	32	22	4	32	6	30	6	19	4	15	3	240	45	6	1	
Indiana:																			
Clay County	14	12	9		1						1						1		2
Delaware County	47	47	39		3		4										1		
Jennings County	4	4			4														
Lake County	343	336	159	47	42	12	19	6	40	12	37	11	5	1	30	9	4	1	7
Marion County	589	589	303	51	63	11	7	1	61	10	12	2	17	3	112	19	14	2	
Monroe County	10	7	7																3
Vermillion County	54	54	27	50	1	2	4	7	1	2	1	2	2	4	14	26	4	7	
Wayne County	15	15	12		1		1		1										
Wells County	23	23	11		1								4		7				
White County	3	3	2						1										
Massachusetts: Middlesex County	24	24	19		1						1				2		1		
Michigan: Kent County	374	373	195	52	29	8	4	1	28	8	18	5	3	1	93	25	3	1	1
Minnesota:																			
Hennepin County	776	775	365	47	66	9			75	10	21	3	25	3	195	25	28	4	1
Ramsey County	270	270	164	61			6	2	36	13	10	4	6	2	36	13	12	4	
New Jersey:																			
Hudson County	1,482	1,482	520	35	352	24	14	1	134	9	9	1	51	3	400	27	2	(2)	
Mercer County	197	197	162	82	9	5	6	3	9	5	1	1	5	3	5	3			
New York:																			
Buffalo	785	785	540	69	1	(2)	30	4	28	4	1	(2)	13	2	160	20	12	2	
Clinton County	18	18	10				1		1		1		1		4				
Columbia County	84	84	39	46	5	6	2	2	1	1	4	5	8	10	23	27	2	2	
Delaware County	14	14	5		1				2				4		2				
Dutchess County	183	182	40	22	33	18	8	4	13	7	4	2	1	1	83	46			1

Erie County	159	158	75	47	------	------	4	3	12	8	1	1	9	6	57	36	------	------	1
Franklin County	25	25	21	------	------	------	1	------	1	------	------	------	1	------	1	------	------	------	------
New York City	5,262	5,106	2,105	41	48	1	590	12	459	9	61	1	246	5	1,493	29	104	2	156
Orleans County	8	8	6	------	1	------	------	------	1	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Westchester County	950	950	295	31	189	20	16	2	83	9	17	2	23	2	303	32	24	3	------
North Carolina:																			
Buncombe County	122	122	71	58	20	16	1	1	4	3	1	1	11	9	12	10	2	2	------
Winston-Salem	239	235	95	40	66	28	1	(2)	9	4	------	------	13	6	44	19	7	3	4
Ohio:																			
Franklin County	674	673	372	55	89	13	16	2	48	7	67	10	16	2	48	7	17	3	1
Hamilton County	1,332	1,330	587	44	49	4	109	8	51	4	38	3	19	1	349	26	128	10	2
Mahoning County	1,391	1,391	442	32	241	17	90	6	112	8	34	2	38	3	374	27	60	4	------
Pennsylvania:																			
Berks County	39	39	24	------	------	------	1	------	------	------	------	------	5	------	7	------	2	------	------
Lycoming County	6	6	3	------	1	------	------	------	------	------	1	------	1	------	------	------	------	------	------
Montgomery County	40	40	28	------	4	------	2	------	1	------	2	------	2	------	1	------	------	------	------
Philadelphia	5,396	5,396	2,038	38	272	5	540	10	267	5	95	2	144	3	1,827	34	213	4	------
Tennessee: Memphis	672	666	262	39	65	10	112	17	34	5	13	2	59	9	97	15	24	4	6
Virginia: Norfolk	615	613	194	32	22	4	24	4	39	6	15	2	34	6	243	40	42	7	2
Washington: Pierce County	98	98	60	61	9	9	4	4	4	4	3	3	------	------	9	9	9	9	------
Wisconsin: Dane County	55	55	36	65	3	5	2	4	------	------	2	4	------	------	12	22	------	------	------

[1] Not shown where base is less than 50.

[2] Less than 1 per cent.

TABLE 7.—*Charges in girls' delinquency cases dealt with by 37 specified courts during 1927* [1]

Court	Girls' delinquency cases																		
	Total	Charge on which referred to court																	
		Total reported	Stealing or attempted stealing		Truancy		Running away		Ungovernable or beyond parental control		Sex offense		Injury or attempted injury to person		Act of carelessness or mischief		Other		Not reported
			Number	Per cent [2]	Number	Per cent [2]	Number	Per cent [2]	Number	Per cent [2]	Number	Per cent [2]	Number	Per cent [2]	Number	Per cent [2]	Number	Per cent [2]	
Total	4,143	4,105	526	13	430	10	760	19	1,130	28	773	19	114	3	283	7	89	2	38
California: San Francisco City and County	77	77	4	5	4	5	25	32	17	22	21	27	------	------	1	1	5	6	------
Connecticut:																			
Bridgeport	76	76	31	41	8	11	6	8	13	17	8	11	------	------	10	13	------	------	------
Hartford	79	79	22	28	5	6	2	3	15	19	29	37	3	4	2	3	1	1	------
Indiana:																			
Clay County	11	11	2	------	------	------	3	------	------	------	6	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Delaware County	18	18	2	------	4	------	5	------	2	------	4	------	------	------	------	------	1	------	------
Lake County	184	183	16	9	13	7	25	14	22	12	101	55	------	------	4	2	2	1	1
Marion County	303	303	42	14	24	8	20	7	153	50	33	11	5	2	16	5	10	3	------
Monroe County	5	2	------	------	------	------	------	------	1	------	1	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	3
Vermillion County	30	30	3	------	3	------	1	------	3	------	15	------	2	------	1	------	2	------	------
Wayne County	9	9	------	------	------	------	2	------	------	------	6	------	------	------	1	------	------	------	------
Wells County	18	18	2	------	1	------	2	------	1	------	8	------	------	------	3	------	1	------	------
Massachusetts: Middlesex County	3	3	1	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	2	------	------	------	------	------	------
Minnesota:																			
Hennepin County	190	190	21	11	17	9	------	------	71	37	54	28	3	2	6	3	18	9	------
Ramsey County	72	71	11	15	------	------	4	6	37	52	19	27	------	------	------	------	------	------	1
New Jersey:																			
Hudson County	203	203	7	3	101	50	6	3	56	28	25	12	4	2	3	1	1	(3)	------
Mercer County	18	18	3	------	------	------	3	------	4	------	4	------	3	------	1	------	------	------	------
New York:																			
Buffalo	51	51	26	51	------	------	14	27	10	20	------	------	------	------	------	------	1	2	------
Clinton County	5	5	------	------	1	------	------	------	2	------	2	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Columbia County	14	14	2	------	------	------	3	------	1	------	7	------	------	------	1	------	------	------	------
Dutchess County	40	40	5	------	18	------	2	------	9	------	4	------	------	------	2	------	------	------	------
Erie County	18	17	2	------	------	------	3	------	9	------	1	------	2	------	------	------	------	------	1
Franklin County	9	9	------	------	------	------	------	------	5	------	4	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
New York City	840	812	135	17	6	1	275	34	273	34	41	5	35	4	40	5	7	1	28
Orleans County	1	1	------	------	------	------	1	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Westchester County	154	154	10	6	52	34	8	5	10	6	47	31	8	5	17	11	2	1	------

North Carolina:																			
Buncombe County	22	22	2	------	1	------	5	------	5	------	2	------	2	------	4	------	1	------	------
Winston-Salem	56	55	14	25	13	24	2	4	9	16	1	2	1	2	11	20	4	7	1
Ohio:																			
Franklin County	209	209	17	8	15	7	11	5	31	15	130	62	------	------	1	[3]	4	2	------
Mahoning County	293	292	26	9	72	25	19	7	67	23	64	22	5	2	35	12	4	1	1
Pennsylvania:																			
Berks County	9	9	5	------	------	------	2	------	------	------	2	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Lycoming County	4	4	------	------	------	------	1	------	------	------	3	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Montgomery	13	13	4	------	------	------	1	------	------	------	8	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Philadelphia	756	756	77	10	46	6	253	33	202	27	49	6	10	1	100	13	19	3	------
Tennessee: Memphis	180	179	21	12	18	10	46	26	38	21	28	16	10	6	13	7	5	3	1
Virginia: Norfolk	113	113	7	6	6	5	4	4	49	43	17	15	19	17	10	9	1	1	------
Washington: Pierce County	28	28	1	------	1	------	2	------	3	------	20	------	------	------	1	------	------	------	------
Wisconsin: Dane County	32	31	5	------	1	------	4	------	12	------	9	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	1

[1] Only 37 of the 42 courts reported girls' delinquency cases.

[2] Not shown where base is less than 50.

[3] Less than 1 per cent.

The great variation in the types of offenses with which children were charged in the different courts, as is shown by Tables 6 and 7, indicates differences in the attitude and practices of the court as well as in social conditions. For example, in boys' cases (Table 6) stealing constituted 42 per cent of all cases and was the most frequent charge in all except five courts reporting 50 or more cases. In Mercer County, N. J., stealing was the charge in 82 per cent of the boys' cases and acts of carelessness or mischief in 3 per cent; in Dutchess County, N. Y., stealing was the charge in 22 per cent of the cases and acts of carelessness or mischief in 46 per cent. Acts of carelessness or mischief were reported more often than stealing in Bridgeport and Hartford, Conn.; Dutchess County and Westchester County, N. Y.; and Norfolk, Va. Apparently in some courts the charge for petty stealing is "mischief" rather than "stealing." Although charges of truancy represented only 8 per cent of all charges they formed 20 per cent or more of the cases reported by Hudson County, N. J.; Westchester County, N. Y.; and Winston-Salem, N. C. Other charges constituting rather large proportions of the cases in certain courts were "running away," 17 per cent in Memphis, Tenn., as compared with 7 per cent in all the courts; "sex offense," 11 per cent in Lake County, Ind., and 10 per cent in Franklin County, Ohio, as compared with 2 per cent in all the courts.

Variations similar to those in boys' cases were evident in the types of offenses with which girls (Table 7) were charged. Five of the courts reporting 50 or more girls' cases showed an unusually large proportion of cases in which girls were referred to the court as runaways. These courts were San Francisco City and County (32 per cent), Buffalo (27 per cent), New York City (34 per cent), Philadelphia (33 per cent), and Memphis (26 per cent). Stealing was the charge in only 13 per cent of all the girls' cases but was the most frequent charge in three courts, occurring in 41 per cent of the girls' cases in Bridgeport, Conn., in 51 per cent in Buffalo, N. Y., and in 25 per cent in Winston-Salem, N. C. Similarly, although charges of truancy formed only 10 per cent of all charges in girls' cases, they constituted 50 per cent of the cases in Hudson County, N. J., and 34 per cent of the cases in Westchester County, N. Y., 29 per cent of the cases in Winston-Salem, N. C., and 25 per cent of the cases in Mahoning County, Ohio. Other charges which were reported in large proportions by certain courts were "injury to person" in Norfolk, Va.; "carelessness or mischief" in Winston-Salem, N. C.; "ungovernable" in Marion County, Ind., Ramsey County, Minn., and Norfolk, Va.; and "sex offense" in Lake County, Ind., and Franklin County, Ohio. The contrast between Lake County, Ind., and Marion County, Ind., so far as the charges "ungovernable" and "sex offense" are concerned, is especially striking. In Lake County the charge was "ungovernable" in 12 per cent of the girls' cases and "sex offense" in 55 per cent; in Marion County it was "ungovernable" in 50 per cent and "sex offense" in 11 per cent. This contrast no doubt reflects in some measure a difference in stating the charge rather than in the types of offenses reported to the courts.

Dispositions.

Official cases.—An analysis of the dispositions, which were reported for 20,679 of the 20,827 delinquency cases dealt with officially by the 42 courts, shows that nearly nine-tenths were (1) dismissed or

continued indefinitely (35 per cent), (2) placed on probation (39 per cent), or (3) committed to institutions for delinquent children (15 per cent). A number of different but related methods of treatment of delinquent children are included under each of these terms. For example, the entry "case dismissed" was made for cases closed without any further action, cases referred to other courts for commitment to institutions for the feeble-minded, and cases dismissed because of lack of jurisdiction in the juvenile court. Cases were considered as "continued indefinitely" when no further action was taken or supervision given the children but when jurisdiction was maintained so that if a like situation arose later the case might be brought into court again without the filing of a new petition. Cases of children placed on probation to parents or committed to institutions with commitment suspended when no further action was contemplated were also classed as "continued indefinitely."

The dispositions of 20,827 official delinquency cases were as follows (the numbers and per cent distribution for boys and girls are shown in Tables 8 and 9 respectively):

Disposition	Number	Per cent distribution
Total	20,827	
Disposition reported	20,679	100
Dismissed or continued indefinitely	7,179	35
Child placed on probation	8,161	39
Child committed to institution for delinquent children	3,046	15
Restitution, fine, or costs	1,202	6
Fine imposed or payment of costs ordered	884	4
Restitution or reparation ordered	318	2
Other disposition	1,091	5
Child placed under supervision of individual other than probation officer	285	1
Child committed to other institution	136	1
Child committed to board, department, or agency	408	2
Child returned home [1]	174	1
Child referred for criminal prosecution	35	(2)
Case otherwise disposed of	53	(2)
Disposition not reported	148	

[1] Applies only to runaways or children living away from own home at the time referred to court.
[2] Less than 1 per cent.

The courts showed wide variation in the extent to which different types of dispositions were used. Such variations are due in many instances to differences in court procedure and practice. For instance, the number of official cases dismissed or continued indefinitely is small if cases are investigated before the filing of a petition and trivial cases are dealt with unofficially or dropped. The proportion of cases in which the child is placed on probation is influenced by several factors, among them the number of cases dismissed or continued indefinitely upon first hearing, the extent to which unofficial probation is used, the local institutions available for short-time commitments, and the care with which children are selected for probation both as to those likely to profit by it and as to the court's facilities for giving such supervision.

Analysis of the percentages of cases disposed of in various ways by courts handling 50 or more official cases shows more clearly the variations from court to court. Each of the courts reported some cases dismissed or continued indefinitely. The percentage so disposed of ranged from 5 in Mercer County, N. J., to 54 in Memphis, Tenn.,

TABLE 8.—*Dispositions in boys' official delinquency cases dealt with by 42 specified courts during 1927*

Court	Boys' official delinquency cases												
		Disposition											
	Total	Total reported	Dismissed or continued indefinitely		Child placed on probation		Child committed to institution for delinquent children		Restitution, fine, or costs		Other		Not reported
			Number	Per cent [1]	Number	Per cent [1]	Number	Per cent [1]	Number	Per cent [1]	Number	Per cent [1]	
Total	17,738	17,610	6,344	36	6,892	39	2,420	14	1,151	7	803	5	128
California: San Francisco City and County	663	632	324	51	159	25	127	20			22	3	31
Connecticut:													
Bridgeport	277	275	87	32	150	55	26	9	10	4	2	1	2
Hartford	320	320	129	40	175	55	12	4	1	(2)	3	1	
Indiana:													
Clay County	7	7					7						
Delaware County	27	27			23		3				1		
Jennings County	4	4	4										
Lake County	232	232	61	26	71	31	60	26	1	(2)	39	17	
Marion County	524	523	74	14	269	51	105	20	53	10	22	4	1
Monroe County	7	7					7						
Vermillion County	3	3			2						1		
Wayne County	8	8			4		3		1				
Wells County	4	4			2		2						
White County	3	3	3										
Massachusetts: Middlesex County	24	24			24								
Michigan: Kent County	374	373	123	33	166	45	50	13	20	5	14	4	1
Minnesota:													
Hennepin County	776	776	355	46	341	44	75	10			5	1	
Ramsey County	270	269	25	9	195	72	37	14			12	4	1
New Jersey:													
Hudson County	1,482	1,481	612	41	281	19	218	15	361	24	9	1	1
Mercer County	197	197	5	3	143	73	43	22	5	3	1	1	
New York:													
Buffalo	785	785	412	52	149	19	136	17	87	11	1	(2)	
Clinton County	15	15	3		8		4						
Columbia County	83	83	39	47	10	12	6	7	22	27	6	7	
Delaware County	14	14	1		10		2				1		
Dutchess County	179	179	61	34	48	27	13	7	42	23	15	8	
Erie County	159	159	23	14	111	70	19	12			6	4	
Franklin County	25	25	8		2		5				10		
New York City	5,262	5,190	2,499	48	1,773	34	590	11	299	6	29	1	72
Orleans County	8	8	3		3		1				1		
Westchester County	562	562	202	36	225	40	81	14	26	5	28	5	

North Carolina:													
Buncombe County	4	4					4						
Winston-Salem	239	239	65	27	121	51	37	15	5	2	11	5	
Ohio:													
Franklin County	674	674	48	7	452	67	143	21	7	1	24	4	
Hamilton County	38	36			6		21				9		2
Mahoning County	335	335	90	27	138	41	54	16	35	10	18	5	
Pennsylvania:													
Berks County	39	39	4		17		18						[1]
Lycoming County	6	6	1				5						
Montgomery County	40	40	2		19		15		3		1		
Philadelphia	2,808	2,808	597	21	1,454	52	334	12	32	1	391	14	
Tennessee: Memphis	499	483	279	58	48	10	119	25	1	[2]	36	7	16
Virginia: Norfolk	615	614	175	29	218	36	18	3	135	22	68	11	1
Washington: Pierce County	97	97	23	24	35	36	19	20	5	5	15	15	
Wisconsin: Dane County	50	50	7	14	40	80	1	2			2	4	

[1] Per cent not shown where base is less than 50.

[2] Less than 1 per cent.

TABLE 9.—*Dispositions in girls' official delinquency cases dealt with by 36 specified courts during 1927* [1]

Court	Girls' official delinquency cases												
	Total	Disposition											
		Total reported	Dismissed or continued indefinitely		Child placed on probation		Child committed to institution for delinquent children		Restitution, fine, or costs		Other		Not reported
			Number	Per cent [2]	Number	Per cent [2]	Number	Per cent [2]	Number	Per cent [2]	Number	Per cent [2]	
Total	3,089	3,069	835	27	1,269	41	626	20	51	2	288	9	20
California: San Francisco City and County	75	75	27	36	17	23	10	13			21	28	
Connecticut:													
Bridgeport	54	54	26	48	19	35	5	9			4	7	
Hartford	58	58	12	21	25	43	19	33			2	3	
Indiana:													
Clay County	6	6	1				5						
Delaware County	11	11			9		2						
Lake County	109	109	39	36	23	21	19	17			28	26	
Marion County	146	146	9	6	114	78	17	12			6	4	
Monroe County	3	3			1		2						
Vermillion County	6	6			5		1						
Wayne County	5	5					5						
Wells County	8	8	1		1		4				2		

[1] Only 37 of the 42 courts reported girls' delinquency cases and 1 court did not report girls' cases disposed of officially.

[2] Per cent not shown where base is less than 50.

TABLE 9.—*Dispositions in girls' official delinquency cases dealt with by 36 specified courts during 1927*—Continued

Court	Girls' official delinquency cases												
	Total	Disposition											
		Total reported	Dismissed or continued indefinitely		Child placed on probation		Child committed to institution for delinquent children		Restitution, fine, or costs		Other		Not reported
			Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	
Massachusetts: Middlesex County	3	3			3								
Minnesota:													
Hennepin County	190	190	49	26	85	45	56	29					
Ramsey County	72	72	7	10	30	42	35	49					
New Jersey:													
Hudson County	203	203	100	49	33	16	32	16	28	14	10	5	
Mercer County	18	18	5		6		7						
New York:													
Buffalo	51	51	24	47	16	31	9	18	2	4			
Clinton County	4	4	1				2				1		
Columbia County	14	14	4		3		3		1		3		
Dutchess County	40	40	20		4		5				11		
Erie County	18	18			7		8				3		
Franklin County	9	9	1				5				3		
New York City	840	827	277	33	369	45	166	20	5	1	10	1	13
Westchester County	95	95	18	19	28	29	26	27	1	1	22	23	
North Carolina:													
Buncombe County	1	1					1						
Winston-Salem	56	55	13	24	31	56	3	5			8	15	1
Ohio:													
Franklin County	209	209	15	7	130	62	49	23	2	1	13	6	
Mahoning County	68	67	17	25	25	37	16	24			9	13	1
Pennsylvania:													
Berks County	9	9	1				6				2		
Lycoming County	4	4					4						
Montgomery County	13	13	1		1		9				2		
Philadelphia	440	440	98	22	203	46	48	11	1	(3)	90	20	
Tennessee: Memphis	102	100	36	36	24	24	21	21			19	19	2
Virginia: Norfolk	113	110	27	25	48	44	10	9	11	10	14	13	3
Washington: Pierce County	26	26	4		3		14				5		
Wisconsin: Dane County	10	10	2		6		2						

[3] Less than 1 per cent.

and was more than 40 per cent in six other courts. Similarly the child was placed on probation in 39 per cent of all cases, but for individual courts this percentage ranged from 12 per cent in Memphis, Tenn., to 77 per cent in Dane County, Wis. In 10 courts the children dealt with were placed on probation in more than half the cases.

Although commitments to institutions for delinquent children were made in only 15 per cent of all cases the proportion of such commitments was more than 20 per cent in seven courts. Orders for restitution, fines, and payment of costs when not accompanied by more significant dispositions, such as probation, were resorted to in a small proportion (6 per cent) of the cases. In four courts, however, such orders were made in about one-fifth of the cases.

Tables 8 and 9 show the extent to which different types of dispositions were used in boys' and in girls' cases. In general, the dispositions of boys' and girls' cases showed no striking differences except in a few courts. Although 36 per cent of the boys' cases and only 27 per cent of the girls' cases were dismissed or continued indefinitely, in Bridgeport, Conn., 32 per cent of the boys' cases and 48 per cent of the girls' cases, and in Lake County, Ind., 26 per cent of the boys' cases and 36 per cent of the girls' cases were so disposed of. Probation was used in a slightly larger proportion of the girls' cases than of the boys' cases, but in 10 of the 17 courts which reported a total of 50 or more girls' cases probation was used more frequently in boys' cases. This was especially noticeable in Bridgeport, Conn., and Ramsey County, Minn. In 14 per cent of the boys' cases as compared with 20 per cent of the girls' cases the child was committed to an institution for delinquent children. This difference between the sexes in the use of such institutions was even greater in Hartford, Conn., and in Ramsey County, Minn. In the former 4 per cent of the boys' cases and 33 per cent of the girls' cases and in the latter 14 per cent of the boys' cases and 49 per cent of the girls' cases were disposed of by commitment to such institutions. Commitments to other institutions or to agencies and use of individuals other than parents or court officers for supervision, which formed part of the group "other disposition" were most commonly used in Lake County, Ind., and Philadelphia, Pa., for boys; and in San Francisco City and County, Calif.; Lake County, Ind.; Westchester County, N. Y.; and Philadelphia, Pa., for girls. Each of these courts reported one and in some instances all of these types of dispositions.

A study of the relation of charges to dispositions in official cases as shown in Table 10 (boys' cases) and Table 11 (girls' cases) reveals some interesting facts as to methods of treatment of different types of offenses.[7] Table 10 shows that in boys' cases dismissal or indefinite continuance was the type of disposition most often used where the charge was injury or attempted injury to person (63 per cent), acts of carelessness or mischief (59 per cent), running away (37 per cent), and a group of miscellaneous charges classified as "other" (59 per cent). Probation was used more often than any other type of disposition in the cases of boys charged with stealing (47 per cent), truancy (36 per cent), sex offense (51 per cent), violating a liquor or drug law (47 per cent), and being ungovernable or beyond parental control (42 per cent). Commitment to an institution for delinquent children

[7] These tables are based on the cases reported by the 41 courts that sent cards to the bureau and do not include figures for Philadelphia, which reported on standard table forms in place of cards.

TABLE 10.—*Charge, by type of disposition, in boys' official delinquency cases dealt with by 41 courts during 1927* [1]

Disposition	Boys' official delinquency cases																			
	Total	Charge on which referred to court																		
		Stealing or attempted stealing		Truancy		Running away		Ungovernable or beyond parental control		Sex offense		Injury or attempted injury to person		Act of carelessness or misehief		Violating liquor or drug law or intoxication		Other		Not reported	
		Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution
Total	14,930	6,740	------	1,210	------	861	------	1,201	------	355	------	551	------	3,533	------	99	------	203	------	177	------
Disposition reported	14,802	6,677	100	1,207	100	852	100	1,192	100	350	100	546	100	3,516	100	98	100	201	100	163	100
Dismissed	4,872	1,562	23	280	23	284	33	247	21	73	21	305	56	1,905	54	22	22	111	55	83	51
Continued indefinitely	875	336	5	139	12	32	4	87	7	24	7	40	7	190	5	13	13	9	4	5	3
Restitution or reparation ordered	286	117	2	------	------	------	------	------	------	1	(2)	19	3	149	4	------	------	------	------	------	------
Fine or payment of costs	833	138	2	93	8	------	------	2	(2)	5	1	13	2	546	16	4	4	27	13	5	3
Child referred for criminal prosecution	32	27	(2)	------	------	------	------	------	------	3	1	------	------	1	(2)	------	------	1	(2)	------	------
Child placed on probation	5,438	3,141	47	432	36	284	33	496	42	180	51	138	25	641	18	46	47	31	15	49	30
Child placed under supervision of individual other than probation officer	192	95	1	28	2	11	1	22	2	8	2	3	1	15	(2)	5	5	5	2	------	------
Child committed to board, department, or agency	51	16	(2)	8	1	5	1	14	1	4	1	------	------	3	(2)	------	------	------	------	1	1
Child committed to institution for delinquent children	2,086	1,203	18	218	18	190	22	305	26	48	14	26	5	56	2	7	7	13	6	20	12
State institution	770	509	8	57	5	54	6	88	7	27	8	9	2	15	(2)	2	2	5	2	4	2
County or city institution	468	251	4	111	9	26	3	40	3	4	1	10	2	19	1	2	2	2	1	3	2
Private institution	571	285	4	38	3	60	7	143	12	13	4	4	1	14	(2)	------	------	5	2	9	6
Type not reported	277	158	2	12	1	50	6	34	3	4	1	3	1	8	(2)	3	3	1	(2)	4	2
Child committed to other institution	54	24	(2)	3	(2)	7	1	16	1	1	(2)	------	------	3	(2)	------	------	------	------	------	------
Child returned home [3]	50	6	(2)	2	(2)	39	5	1	(2)	------	------	1	(2)	------	------	------	------	1	(2)	------	------
Other disposition	33	12	(2)	4	(2)	------	------	2	(2)	3	1	1	(2)	7	(2)	1	1	3	1	------	------
Disposition not reported	128	63	------	3	------	9	------	9	------	5	------	5	------	17	------	1	------	2	------	14	------

[1] Philadelphia not included. [2] Less than 1 per cent. [3] Applies only to runaways or children living away from own homes at the time referred to court.

TABLE 11.—*Charge, by type of disposition, in girls' official delinquency cases dealt with by 35 courts during 1927* [1]

Disposition	Girls' official delinquency cases																	
	Total	Charge on which referred to court																
		Stealing or attempted stealing		Truancy		Running away		Ungovernable or beyond parental control		Sex offense		Injury or attempted injury to person		Act of carelessness or mischief		Violating liquor or drug law or intoxication (number) [2]	Other (number) [2]	Not reported (number) [2]
		Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution			
Total	2,649	381	------	267	------	417	------	723	------	599	------	78	------	96	------	26	29	33
Disposition reported	2,629	379	100	266	100	414	100	718	100	596	100	78	100	92	100	26	28	32
Dismissed	588	107	28	102	38	84	20	105	15	75	13	40	51	57	62	4	8	6
Continued indefinitely	149	23	6	33	12	21	5	42	6	13	2	4	5	6	7	------	5	2
Restitution or reparation ordered	6	4	1	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	2	3	------	------	------	------	------
Fine imposed or payment of costs ordered	44	1	(3)	24	9	1	(3)	1	(3)	1	(3)	8	10	7	8	------	1	------
Child referred for criminal prosecution	2	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	2	(3)	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Child placed on probation	1,066	181	48	85	32	178	43	327	46	212	36	22	28	20	22	14	10	17
Child placed under supervision of individual other than probation officer	79	11	3	7	3	10	2	25	3	22	4	1	1	------	------	3	------	------
Child committed to board, department, or agency	34	4	1	1	(2)	5	1	7	1	15	3	------	------	1	1	------	1	------
Child committed to institution for delinquent children	578	46	12	13	5	89	21	194	27	220	37	1	1	1	1	4	3	7
State institution	229	19	5	5	2	11	3	56	8	136	23	------	------	1	1	------	------	1
County or city institution	77	4	1	------	------	7	·2	29	4	26	4	1	1	------	------	4	3	3
Private institution	214	16	4	7	3	56	14	86	12	46	8	------	------	------	------	------	------	3
Type not reported	58	7	2	1	(3)	15	4	23	3	12	2	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Child committed to other institution	33	1	(3)	------	------	2	(3)	12	2	18	3	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Child returned home [4]	32	------	------	------	------	22	5	4	1	5	1	------	------	------	------	1	------	------
Other disposition	18	1	(3)	1	(3)	2	(3)	1	(3)	13	2	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Disposition not reported	20	2	------	1	------	3	------	5	------	3	------	------	------	4	------	------	1	1

[1] Only 37 of the 42 courts reported girls' delinquency cases; one court did not report girls' cases disposed of officially; figures for Philadelphia are not included in this table.
[2] Per cent distribution not shown where base is less than 50.
[3] Less than 1 per cent.
[4] Applies only to runaways or children living away from own home at the time referred to court.

was reported in 26 per cent of the cases of boys described as ungovernable or beyond parental control and in 22 per cent of the cases in which the boy was charged with running away. Fines or costs were ordered chiefly in the cases of boys charged with acts of carelessness or mischief (16 per cent).

As is shown in Table 11, the treatment of girls for certain offenses was similar to that of boys. Dismissal or indefinite continuance was the disposition most frequently used in cases where the offense was injury to person (56 per cent) or act of carelessness or mischief (69 per cent); probation was used more often than any other type of disposition in the cases of girls charged with stealing (48 per cent), and with being ungovernable (46 per cent); and the proportions of cases in which girls were committed to institutions for delinquent children as ungovernable (27 per cent), or as runaways (21 per cent), were about the same as those for boys. In girls' cases, however, dismissal or indefinite continuance was the disposition most frequently used when the charge was truancy (50 per cent) and probation when the charge was running away (43 per cent). Commitment to an institution was used proportionately more frequently for sex offenses of girls than for any other offense among either boys or girls; the contrast in treatment of boys and of girls for this offense is striking. In 14 per cent of the cases of boys charged with sex offenses the boy was committed to an institution for delinquent children and in 51 per cent he was placed on probation, whereas in 37 per cent of the cases of girls who were sex delinquents the girl was committed to an institution for delinquent children and in 36 per cent she was placed on probation. On the other hand, when truancy was the charge, children were sent to such institutions in only 5 per cent of the girls' cases as compared with 18 per cent of the boys' cases, and girls less frequently than boys were committed to institutions on charges of stealing. The percentages of institution commitments for the two sexes were about the same in cases of runaways and ungovernable children.

Unofficial cases.—Of the 7,525 unofficial delinquency cases for which the disposition was reported more than one-half (58 per cent) were closed because the difficulty was adjusted; in approximately one-seventh (14 per cent) the children were placed unofficially under the supervision of probation officers; and a large proportion of the remaining cases were apparently dropped without action of any sort ("dismissed" or "no action taken" was frequently reported under "other disposition").

The following table shows the dispositions of unofficial delinquency cases dealt with by the 23 courts reporting such cases:

Disposition	Number	Per cent distribution
Total	7,560	
Disposition reported	7,525	100
Placement of child in institution recommended	203	3
Placement of child elsewhere recommended	72	1
Child placed on unofficial probation	1,073	14
Referred to agency or other court	176	2
Child returned home [1]	266	4
Difficulty adjusted	4,356	58
Other disposition	1,379	18
Disposition not reported	35	

[1] Applies only to runaways or children living away from own home at the time referred to court.

As is shown by Table 12, with the exception of cases in which children were charged with running away and simply returned home, and the four cases of girls charged with violating liquor or drug laws, "difficulty adjusted" was the disposition most frequently reported for all types of offenses both in boys' cases and in girls' cases. More than half the cases in which boys were charged with injury to person, mischief, and miscellaneous offenses classified as "other," and more than half the cases in which girls were charged with stealing, truancy, injury to person, mischief, being ungovernable, and miscellaneous offenses were so disposed of. Unofficial probation was used more frequently for boys than for girls.

TABLE 12.—*Charge, by disposition and sex of child, in unofficial delinquency cases dealt with by 22 courts during 1927* [1]

Disposition	Unofficial delinquency cases										
	Total	Charge on which referred to court									
		Stealing or attempted stealing	Truancy	Running away	Ungovernable or beyond parental control	Sex offense	Injury or attempted injury to person	Act of carelessness or mischief	Violating liquor or drug law	Other charge	Charge not reported
Total	4,656	1,323	474	424	470	216	145	1,343	57	186	18
Boys	3,918	1,255	357	334	265	91	119	1,256	53	175	13
Total reported	3,890	1,245	353	330	262	90	119	1,250	53	175	13
Placement of child in institution recommended	144	83	4	20	11	4	3	12	3	4	-------
Placement of child elsewhere recommended	54	34	4	7	4	1	-------	3	1	-------	-------
Child placed on unofficial probation	753	393	68	17	63	22	20	117	17	30	6
Referred to agency or other court	101	45	9	18	8	4	-------	11	2	1	3
Child returned home [2]	197	15	2	178	-------	-------	-------	-------	1	1	-------
Difficulty adjusted	1,698	421	142	69	95	39	70	749	18	91	4
Other disposition	943	254	124	21	81	20	26	358	11	48	-------
Disposition not reported	28	10	4	4	3	1	-------	6	-------	-------	-------
Girls	738	68	117	90	205	125	26	87	4	11	5
Total reported	731	68	116	89	203	124	26	85	4	11	5
Placement of child in institution recommended	16	1	-------	4	5	4	-------	-------	-------	1	1
Placement of child elsewhere recommended	18	3	1	1	8	5	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Child placed on unofficial probation	111	12	18	14	25	19	5	12	3	1	2
Referred to agency or other court	37	3	8	3	11	9	-------	3	-------	-------	-------
Child returned home	43	-------	-------	32	7	4	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Difficulty adjusted	367	36	61	26	111	59	21	44	1	7	1
Other disposition	139	13	28	9	36	24	-------	26	-------	2	1
Disposition not reported	7	-------	1	1	2	1	-------	2	-------	-------	-------

[1] Nineteen of the 42 courts did not report delinquency cases disposed of unofficially; figures for Philadelphia, which reported on standard table forms instead of cards, are not included in this table.

[2] Applies only to runaways or children living away from own home at the time referred to court.

Cases discharged from probation.

The 31 courts sending in cards or tables for cases of delinquent children discharged from probation reported 5,029 such cases. The majority (4,493) of these were discharged from official probation. The number of such cases discharged from probation was considerably less than the number officially placed on probation (7,905). Unofficial probation cases were reported by only 15 courts, and almost one-half (273) of these cases were reported by one Ohio court (Hamilton County). The probation period was in most instances of brief duration, usually only a few months. The preponderance of cases in which the length of the probation period was less than one year is partly due to the fact that several courts, among them one large court, made cards only for those cases in which the children were both placed on probation and discharged therefrom during 1927. The figures for children discharged from probation who had been placed on probation before the courts began to use the statistical plan which forms the basis for this report doubtless were less complete in some courts than the figures for children placed on and discharged from probation the same year.

The reasons for discharge from probation were as follows:

Reason for discharge	Number	Per cent distribution
Total	5,029	
Reason for discharge reported	5,007	100
Child reached age limit	258	5
Further supervision not recommended [1] or discharged with improvement	3,289	66
Child committed to institution for delinquent children	783	16
Child committed to other institution, agency, or individual	196	4
Other reason	481	10
Reason for discharge not reported	22	

[1] The first edition of card No. 3 read "Further probationary supervision not recommended." This item was found to be generally used to note the termination of the period with improvement and a later print of the card was changed to read "Discharged with improvement before age limit."

The extent to which children who had been on probation were committed to institutions for delinquent children varied greatly in the different courts, the proportion of such commitments ranging in courts reporting 50 or more cases from 3 per cent to 28 per cent. In most of the courts for which the number of commitments was high the courts used county or private institutions for short-term commitments, the purpose of which was chiefly disciplinary; upon release from the institution the child was likely to be placed again on probation.

DEPENDENCY AND NEGLECT CASES

Sources of complaint.

In some localities where many social agencies exist the court may prefer to have dependency and neglect cases investigated first by a social agency so that only cases needing court action are brought to court. In other localities, especially where there are few agencies, the court may make its own investigation of cases and receive complaints from any interested person, including parents and relatives.

Of the 12,063 dependency and neglect cases for which the source of complaint was reported 48 per cent were referred to court by social agencies and 36 per cent were referred by parents or relatives. The differences in practice among the 34 courts dealing with dependency and neglect cases are indicated by the variations in the percentages of cases received from social agencies and from parents and relatives in the various localities. In general, when the proportion referred by a social agency was large the proportion referred by parents or relatives was small, and vice versa.

The sources of complaint in dependency and neglect cases were as follows:

Source of complaint	Number	Per cent distribution
Total	12,150	
Source of complaint reported	12,063	100
Social agency	5,737	48
Parents or relatives	4,290	36
Other individual (not probation officer)	387	3
Police	665	6
Probation officer	488	4
School department	280	2
Other source of complaint	216	2
Source of complaint not reported	87	

The percentage of dependency and neglect cases referred to court by social agencies (48 per cent for the 34 courts) ranged in individual courts reporting 50 or more cases from 10 to 100 and was more than 80 per cent in eight courts.[8] The proportion referred by parents or relatives (36 per cent of all cases) also showed great variation, ranging from no cases to 67 per cent. The number of cases received from other sources was generally small and showed no unusual variations except in three courts, where large proportions were referred by probation officers—Lake County, Ind. (51 per cent); Norfolk, Va. (21 per cent); and Pierce County, Wash. (28 per cent).

Places of care pending hearing or disposition.

The situation with regard to detention of children in dependency and neglect cases was similar to that in delinquency cases, except that practically no children (7 in 10,611 cases for which place of care was reported) were detained in jail. More than half the children were not detained; they were allowed to remain in their homes pending hearing or their cases were disposed of on the day the complaint was made. Boarding homes were used by most of the courts, but the number of cases so cared for was small. Detention homes, receiving homes or shelters of private agencies, and other institutions were used in slightly more than one-third of the cases. Most of the cases reported as cared for in receiving homes or other institutions were reported by New York City.

[8] San Francisco City and County, Calif.; Bridgeport, Conn.; Hennepin County and Ramsey County, Minn.; Buffalo, Dutchess County, and Westchester County, N. Y.; and Mahoning County, Ohio.

The places where children were cared for pending hearing or disposition in dependency and neglect cases were as follows:

Place of care pending hearing	Number	Per cent distribution
Total	12,150	
Place of care reported	10,611	100
Own home or case disposed of same day	5,890	56
Boarding home	540	5
Detention home or other institution	3,793	36
Detention home	559	5
Other institution	3,234	30
Jail or police station	7	(1)
Only place of care	6	(1)
One of the places of care	1	(1)
More than one place of care [2]	92	1
Other place of care	289	3
Place of care not reported [3]	1,539	

[1] Less than 1 per cent.
[2] Not including detention home, police station, or jail.
[3] Including Philadelphia unofficial cases, for which place of care was not reported.

Charges.

More than one-third (38 per cent) of the dependency and neglect cases were referred to court because of improper conditions in the home, including conditions such as immorality or intoxication. More than one-fourth (30 per cent) were referred for insufficient parental care, including lack of care because of illness or death of parents. In only a small proportion of cases (13 per cent) was financial need the chief reason for bringing the child to court. Great variation occurred in charges reported by different courts. For example, in courts reporting 50 or more cases, the percentages referred because of improper conditions ranged from 11 to 77 and those referred because of insufficient parental care ranged from 5 to 68. Four courts reported that more than half their cases were referred because of insufficient parental care. Explanation of these variations may be differences in local procedure. For example, the neglect cases may be referred to the court while dependency cases are handled by other social agencies, and there may be differences of interpretation as between insufficient parental care and financial need.

The charges on which dependency and neglect cases were referred to court were as follows:

Charge	Number	Per cent distribution
Total	12,150	
Charge reported	12,074	100
Abandonment or desertion	808	7
Abuse or cruel treatment	307	3
Improper conditions in home	4,552	38
Insufficient parental care	3,620	30
Financial need	1,572	13
Question of custody	639	5
Other charge	576	5
Charge not reported	76	

Dependency and neglect cases were tabulated not only on the basis of the individual children concerned but also on the basis of different families represented. That is, in the latter tabulations each family was counted only once for each time it was dealt with by the court on a new charge involving one or more of the children. The distribution according to charge is somewhat different when based upon families than when based upon children's cases. If the figures are omitted for the New York City court—for which no attempt was made to group cards by families and which handles only cases of neglect, dependency cases being cared for by other agencies—the number of cases of dependent and neglected children reported was 8,907, representing 4,566 families. Of the 4,540 of these families for which charge was reported 20 per cent were referred to court because of alleged improper conditions in the home, 34 per cent because of insufficient parental care, 15 per cent because of financial need, 10 per cent because of questions of custody, 10 per cent because of abandonment or desertion, and 10 per cent because of other reasons.

Dispositions.

The three types of disposition used in 99 per cent of the official dependency and neglect cases were commitment to institutions or agencies, placement under supervision of the court or of an individual, and dismissal or indefinite continuance of the case. As is shown by Table 13, almost half (49 per cent) of these dependency and neglect cases dealt with by the 34 courts reporting cases of dependency and neglect were disposed of by the commitment of the child to the care of an agency or an institution, most of which were maintained for the care of dependent children. Such commitments varied in the different courts reporting 50 or more cases from 18 per cent of the cases in Norfolk, Va., to 97 per cent in Hamilton County, Ohio. The relative proportions of commitments to agencies and to institutions by the individual courts indicate differences in local facilities for caring for dependent children as well as differences in court policy with regard to use of institutions or other methods of care for these children. Some courts probably committed the children to agencies, which then may have placed them in institutions. Commitment to an agency represented 50 per cent or more of the dispositions in Hennepin County, Minn., and Buffalo, Erie County, and Westchester County, N. Y.; commitment to an institution represented 50 per cent or more of the dispositions in Marion County, Ind., and Franklin County, Hamilton County, and Mahoning County, Ohio.

Children were placed under the supervision of court officers or of individuals in one-fourth of the cases, court supervision being used more frequently. The most striking variations from the average were Ramsey County, Minn., which reported 62 per cent of its cases disposed of by placing the child under the supervision of a court officer, and Buncombe County, N. C., which reported 65 per cent of its cases disposed of by placing the child under the supervision of an individual other than a court officer. A few courts did not use either of these two types of supervision to any considerable extent.

One-fourth of the official cases were dismissed or continued indefinitely. The percentage of cases so disposed of in the different courts ranged from none in Pierce County, Wash., and Buncombe County, N. C., to 46 per cent in Bridgeport, Conn., and Columbia County, N. Y., and was more than 30 per cent in 7 courts.

TABLE 13.—*Dispositions of official dependency and neglect cases dealt with by 34 specified courts during 1927*

Court	Official dependency and neglect cases														
	Total	Disposition													
		Total reported	Dismissed or continued indefinitely		Child placed under court supervision		Child placed under supervision of individual		Child committed to board, department, or agency		Child committed to institution		Other		Not reported
			Number	Per cent [1]	Number	Per cent [1]	Number	Per cent [1]	Number	Per cent [1]	Number	Per cent [1]	Number	Per cent [1]	
Total	9,777	9,744	2,395	25	1,898	19	593	6	2,100	22	2,639	27	119	1	33
California: San Francisco City and County	684	684	228	33	65	10	5	1	264	39	105	15	17	2	
Connecticut:															
Bridgeport	70	69	32	46	4	6			3	4	29	42	1	1	1
Hartford	142	142	28	20	4	3	4	3	31	22	66	46	9	6	
Indiana:															
Clay County	4	4									4				
Jennings County	12	12	10		1						1				
Lake County	213	213	30	14	18	8	64	30	48	23	46	22	7	3	
Marion County	291	291	3	1	48	16	16	5	73	25	145	50	6	2	
Wayne County	20	20							18		2				
White County	7	7	4		3										
Michigan: Kent County	208	207	93	45	29	14	32	15	2	1	50	24	1	(2)	1
Minnesota:															
Hennepin County	342	342	124	36			6	2	170	50	42	12			
Ramsey County	111	111	7	6	69	62	3	3	27	24	4	4	1	1	
New York:															
Buffalo	95	95	4	4	1	1			62	65	28	29			
Clinton County	48	48	3		10		7				28				
Columbia County	121	121	56	46	34	28	4	3	2	2	19	16	6	5	
Dutchess County	259	259	76	29	80	31	34	13	57	22	3	1	9	3	
Erie County	54	54	15	28					39	72					
Franklin County	24	24	9				6		3		6				
New York City	3,243	3,223	1,007	31	913	28	8	(2)	32	1	1,257	39	6	(2)	20
Orleans County	14	14	3		2		1		6		2				
Westchester County	297	297	86	29			25	8	169	57	12	4	5	2	
North Carolina:															
Buncombe County	57	57					37	65			20	35			
Winston-Salem	24	24	1		5		11				4		3		

Ohio:															
Franklin County	262	261	24	9	23	9	47	18	26	10	135	52	6	2	1
Hamilton County	114	109	1	1			2	2	45	41	61	56			5
Mahoning County	190	190	25	13	2	1	25	13	19	10	115	61	4	2	
Pennsylvania:															
Berks County	13	13							8		5				
Lycoming County	17	17			1				7		9				
Montgomery County	31	31			11		17		3						
Philadelphia	2,312	2,312	404	17	499	22	145	6	912	39	343	15	9	(2)	
Tennessee: Memphis	190	185	52	28	36	19	20	11	35	19	37	20	5	3	5
Virginia: Norfolk	186	186	68	37	22	12	41	22	17	9	17	9	21	11	
Washington: Pierce County	79	79			6	8	24	30	7	9	39	49	3	4	
Wisconsin: Dane County	43	43	2		12		9		15		5				

[1] Not shown where base is less than 50.

[2] Less than 1 per cent.

Of the 2,192 unofficial dependency and neglect cases for which dispositions were reported more than half (58 per cent) were reported as closed because some social adjustment was made to relieve the situation. The dispositions in the remainder of the cases were as follows: Referred to an agency or another court, 16 per cent; placement of child in an institution or elsewhere recommended, 6 per cent; child placed under supervision of a probation officer, 3 per cent; and other disposition, 17 per cent.

Cases discharged from supervision.

Sixteen courts reported 1,184 cases of dependent and neglected children discharged from court supervision (which corresponds to probation in delinquency cases), but most of these cases were reported by three courts (San Francisco City and County, 192; New York City, 405; and Philadelphia, 461). In all but 21 of the cases discharged from supervision the child had been placed under supervision by official court order. The contrast between the number of cases of children placed under court supervision and the number of cases in which children were discharged therefrom was not so great in dependency and neglect cases as in delinquency cases. The number officially placed under court supervision by the courts which reported cases discharged from official supervision was 1,677. As in probation cases, the period of supervision was brief, usually only a few months. In 60 per cent of the cases the child was reported as discharged because the situation improved or further supervision was deemed unnecessary and in 23 per cent because he was committed to an institution or agency.

The reasons for discharge from supervision were as follows:

Reason for discharge	Number	Per cent distribution
Total	1,184	100
Child reached age limit	8	1
Further supervision not recommended[1] or child discharged with improvement	710	60
Child committed to institution or agency	268	23
Child committed to individual	30	3
Other reason	168	14

[1] The first edition of card No. 3 read "Further probationary supervision not recommended." This item was found to be used generally to note the termination of the period with improvement, and a later print of the card was changed to read "Discharged with improvement before age limit."

APPENDIX.—TREND IN JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The statistics for the year 1927 published in the body of this report are the first to be compiled by the Children's Bureau in accordance with the uniform plan outlined, and there are no figures for previous years with which they can be compared. For several years, however, the Children's Bureau has compiled such information as could be obtained concerning juvenile delinquency [1] from the annual reports of the juvenile courts throughout the country. Lack of uniformity in methods of compiling statistics used in the different courts and marked variations in inclusions and methods of presentation make the statistics practically valueless for purposes of comparing delinquency rates in one city with those of other cities. Such figures are, however, of value in determining the trend in juvenile delinquency in a given city over a period of years. This fragmentary evidence concerning trend indicates that assertions regarding increase of delinquency have little or no basis in fact, though much unnecessary delinquency exists, and a scientific approach to the problem becomes increasingly important.

The material now available which is of significance in connection with a consideration of trends in juvenile delinquency is summarized under the following headings: Delinquency rates in 13 cities, in different parts of the country, based on annual reports of courts; and statistics of juvenile delinquents committed to institutions during the first six months of 1923 as reported by the United States Bureau of the Census (Children under Institutional Care, 1923).

DELINQUENCY RATES IN 13 CITIES

The table on page 36 shows the number of delinquency cases per 1,000 children of juvenile-court age in 13 cities for which statistics are available for the years 1915 to 1925 or 1926. (For some of these cities statistics can be obtained for part of the period only.) The notes to the table explain the sources from which the statistics were compiled. As has been pointed out, these figures are of value in determining the trend in juvenile delinquency in a given city, but they can not be used for the purpose of comparing delinquency rates in different cities. Great confusion exists with reference to types of cases included, some cities reporting only cases officially heard by the court and others reporting, in addition, cases adjusted unofficially by the probation department. There is also much difference in the extent to which the police of the different cities turn over to their courts the children whom they have apprehended.

The data in this table indicate for most of the cities lower delinquency rates at the end of the period than at the beginning. Slight

[1] Several editions of a mimeographed statement entitled "Trend in Juvenile-Delinquency Statistics," the last dated October 31, 1927, have been issued. Because of the more comprehensive plan in which the Children's Bureau is now engaged this statement will no longer be kept in circulation.

fluctuations from year to year are to be expected and are not especially significant. The decrease in New York has been quite marked, the rate at the beginning of the period being 11.1 as compared with 6.3 in 1926. Providence and Boston, like several other cities, had higher rates during 1918 and 1919, but the Providence rate has declined markedly since 1919. The Boston figures show a marked decrease since 1918 and 1919 except for a slight rise in the period 1923 to 1925, declining again in 1926. The Boston rates for the years since 1920 are considerably lower than the rates for any previous year. The Philadelphia rate has shown little change from 1921 to 1926, though slightly higher rates were reported in 1923 and 1924 than in earlier or later years. The Seattle rate increased rather consistently.

Number of delinquency cases [1] per 1,000 children of juvenile-court age (over 6 years of age and within the juvenile-court age [2]); 13 cities, 1915–1926

Year	Boston [3]	Buffalo	Chicago [3]	Detroit [3]	Minneapolis [4]	New Orleans	New York	Philadelphia [4]	Providence	Richmond	St. Louis	Seattle	Washington [3]
1926	15.8	10.8	4.8	14.8	13.0	------	6.3	20.1	10.4	46.3	------	20.5	43.4
1925	17.3	10.4	5.7	13.6	15.6	13.4	7.2	19.3	10.8	43.5	------	18.7	45.6
1924	16.5	10.5	6.1	11.0	14.1	13.7	6.4	22.1	13.3	40.1	13.3	15.9	42.8
1923	15.8	12.1	4.4	11.6	15.9	12.1	6.5	23.9	14.1	41.3	15.9	17.9	41.0
1922	14.5	9.8	4.2	9.6	17.8	16.4	6.8	20.0	12.0	39.0	12.4	17.6	44.9
1921	16.9	------	5.6	9.5	------	20.7	7.4	20.9	15.9	46.4	13.5	15.9	44.5
1920	18.7	14.7	5.9	11.2	------	20.5	8.6	------	16.1	44.0	13.7	16.2	52.1
1919	26.5	13.9	7.5	12.0	------	22.3	10.1	------	20.4	49.3	18.1	10.5	54.4
1918	24.8	23.6	5.8	12.5	------	18.7	10.6	------	20.9	54.6	19.1	7.7	50.4
1917	23.9	14.2	5.8	10.1	------	20.2	10.9	------	15.6	53.7	17.3	10.0	-------
1916	20.4	12.5	5.5	8.7	------	22.9	8.8	------	15.3	43.2	14.2	11.5	-------
1915	23.6	------	5.9	8.6	------	22.8	11.1	------	13.3	------	------	13.5	-------

[1] The numbers of cases were compiled from the annual reports of the courts, either printed or in manuscript, with the exception of the Boston figures, which were compiled from the annual reports of the State department of correction (formerly bureau of prisons); the Detroit figures, which were compiled from the annual reports of the Michigan State Welfare Commission; and the Minneapolis figures for 1926, which were compiled from the statistical cards sent to the Children's Bureau in connection with the bureau's plan for obtaining uniform juvenile-court statistics. The delinquency figures relate to cases, not children, with the exception of the Richmond figures, which relate to children; that is, if the same child was in court twice during the year he was counted twice. Cases dealt with unofficially as well as official cases are included.

[2] Population estimates were based on the 1910 and 1920 censuses. If the court exercised jurisdiction over a county the population of the county was used.

[3] Chicago, fiscal year Dec. 1 to Nov. 30; Detroit and Washington, fiscal year ending June 30, of the year indicated; Boston, some years calendar, other years fiscal.

[4] Figures shown here differ from those in earlier editions of this table owing to changes in the courts' methods of counting cases.

JUVENILES COMMITTED TO INSTITUTIONS FOR JUVENILE DELINQUENTS AND TO PENAL INSTITUTIONS AS REPORTED BY THE UNITED STATES BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Published census reports of juvenile delinquents in institutions or committed to institutions are available for the years 1880, 1890, 1904, 1910, and 1923. Differences in methods of taking the census make the figures for the earlier years only roughly comparable, but the statistics for 1910 and 1923 are not seriously affected by such differences. The figures include persons in or committed to institutions for juvenile delinquents and persons under 18 years of age in or committed to prisons and reformatories, jails, and workhouses.

The number of persons 10 to 17 years of age enumerated on a given date in institutions of the kind specified per 100,000 population of the same age was 143.4 in 1880, 149.2 in 1890, and 154.5 in 1923.

The relatively slight increase reflects the more adequate provision of institutional care especially adapted to juvenile delinquents in 1923 as compared with the earlier period. It is not possible to present similar ratios for 1904 and 1910, but considering only persons in institutions for juvenile delinquents and not persons in penal institutions the ratio per 100,000 population has been practically stationary since 1904. The growth of the probation system has come mainly within the period since that date.

A more significant figure is the number of commitments during a given period. The total number of delinquent persons 10 to 17 years of age admitted to institutions of all types during the entire year 1910 was 24,854, or 171.7 delinquents per 100,000 of the same age. The corresponding figure for 1923 (estimate based on exact figures for first six months) was 25,565, a ratio of 156.5 per 100,000 population of the same age. (The ratio in 1923 would have been 161 if the small number of dependent children admitted to institutions for juvenile delinquents had been included as it was in 1910.) There has thus been a decline in delinquent children committed to institutions if growth in population is taken into consideration.

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 05708 5217

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 05708 5266

FEB 1 6 1923